

MAY 27 1961

Letters

The Case for Armed U.S. Intervention in Cuba

The writer of the following letter, former political editor of the Times of Havana, fled Cuba last fall. He is a frequent visitor to the Berkshires.

To the Editor of THE EAGLE:—

On May 10 an advertisement appeared in the New York Times signed by 71 people, most of them Harvard professors, under the title, "An Open Letter to President Kennedy."

The signers asked that the U.S. government should reverse the present drift toward American military intervention in Cuba; give no further support for the invasion of Cuba by exile groups; seek to detach the Castro regime from the Communist bloc by diplomatic and trade relations; and concentrate its constructive efforts on eliminating in other parts of Latin America the social conditions which feed totalitarianism.

The ad went on to say that an agency of the U.S. government [CIA] had planned, organized and directed the abortive invasion attempt on Cuba, by Cuban patriots, on April 17. The statement continued, "This agency, acting in secret, and deceiving both the American people and the Cuban rebels—particularly the most democratic among those rebels—has blundered . . ."

Note that the main attack of Communist Cuba and Soviet propaganda has been directed against that self-same CIA, which was the main target of the men of Harvard. Note that "the most democratic among those rebel leaders"—in the opinion of the Harvard sages—must necessarily be Manuel Ray (who was castigated by all Cubans in exile for proposing at one time a platform identical to Castro's), who just happened to have been at Harvard four days before the ad came out.

The professors say that the CIA acted "secretly." This is the primary duty of any intelligence service. The CIA also "deceived both the American people and the Cuban rebels," say these gentlemen. It therefore intimates that the U.S. government and the Cuban rebels knew little about the CIA's activities with regard to Cuba. If this is said seriously as a fact, it

is a gross misrepresentation. The U.S. government knew; the Cuban rebel leaders knew; the professors did not, nor were they supposed to.

The Harvard sages then proceeded to blame U.S. policy for everything that has taken place in Cuba. American economic power, they state, "might have been wielded to further Cuban [Castro] democracy." Instead, they allege, it was "wasted in a fruitless effort to weaken and undermine the [Castro] regime."

Do they maintain that there was any sort of Cuban democracy under Castro? Never, at any time, did the Communist dictator of Cuba entertain the notion of instituting democracy in Cuba. Early in 1959, it was evident to us, although it is still not evident to them, that Castro's Communist gang was determined to hand the once prosperous island of Cuba over to their Communist masters. Cuba is a Soviet colony today.

"The United States' determination to isolate Cuba made the Soviet bloc Castro's only source of military and economic support . . ." So say the men of Harvard. We quote Fidel Castro in 1959: "Armas, para qué?" (Arms for what?) This is what the paladin of "social reform" said in Cuba then. In January of that year, he stressed the fact that Cuba did not need any foreign loans. He repeated that statement before and after his U.S. trip in April 1959.

On the other hand, the real power in Cuba, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, stated repeatedly that Cuban economy would veer away from "American imperialistic dominance and support." Guevara announced early in the game that it was his intention to gear Cuban economy to its Sino-Soviet counterparts. He proceeded to do just that, with Castro's support.

"This resulted," continue the Harvard paragons, "as has happened so often before, in a sharp increase in the power of the local Communist party." This statement betrays ignorance, naïveté and ingenueness.

All political parties were declared legal by the Cuban government of Jan. 1, 1959. One party alone emerged from the ashes of the

Batista regime on that very same date: the duly accredited Communist party of Cuba (PCP), which had been proscribed up until that date. This was not accident; it was design.

"Any further effort to destroy Castro would serve only to intensify terror within Cuba," say the gentlemen from Harvard. In 1941, that phrase would have read: "Any further effort to destroy Hitler would serve only to intensify terror within Europe."

Terror, then, must not be fought or opposed, because it may intensify. Just allow it to remain at the same intensity. These gentlemen sit comfortably in Cambridge and have never lived under the terror which we, as Cubans, have witnessed. Let the Cubans suffer. Do not attempt to destroy Castro.

The next question posed by the mentors is: "Can anyone believe that a free Cuban government would emerge from these circumstances?" The answer is yes, we can. They would imply that armed U.S. intervention in Cuba would bring with it serfdom. Cuba is bound by Communist shackles today; and a U.S. move to safeguard her national and our hemisphere security would bring with it a resurgence of Cuban freedom from Red slavery.

The savants state that any U.S. move into Cuba would establish "anti-Americanism as the central theme of Latin-American politics for decades to come." That is precisely what the theme is now. The Communist invasion of Cuba has increased, not decreased the theme, by means of subversion, propaganda and bribery throughout Latin America.

The men from Harvard are not through. "Further intervention in Cuba will give the lie to our professions of great respect for treaty obligations . . ." So they say. The U.S. and all the Latin-American countries are bound by treaty obligations of the 1948 Rio de Janeiro pact "to assist the victim . . . if the inviolability, or political independence of any American state should be affected by an aggression which is not armed attack."

measures "for the common defense and for the maintenance of the

peace and security of the continent," under the same treaty.

The U.S. and all the Latin American countries adopted a resolution at the 10th Inter-American Conference of Foreign Ministers, 1954, known as the Declaration of Caracas, which clearly states: " . . . the domination or control of the political institutions of American state by the international Communist movement . . . would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states." Among the remedies, effective military action to erase the threat.

This, too, is a treaty obligation of the U.S. and all Latin American countries; and the situation Cuba calls for the application of the pertinent articles of the Treaty and the Caracas Declaration.

The gentlemen of Harvard veniently overlook this kind treaty obligation; although President Kennedy was pointedly aware of them when he said on April 17, "Should it ever appear that the Inter-American doctrine of non-interference merely conceals a policy of non-action; if nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their common obligations against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this government will not hesitate to meet its prime obligations, which are the security of the nation."

However, the gentlemen of Harvard feel that these commitments do not exist. And they veniently ignore what was said and agreed to by their own country and all Latin-American nations.

One thing is noteworthy in the advertisement: Never at any time do the professors refer to the U.S. government as being Communist as announced by Fidel Castro himself on May 1, 1961. "His particular brand of social revolution" is what the Cambridge men term the "right communism of Cuba." "particular brand of social revolution" has enslaved, terrorized, killed, tortured, maimed and imprisoned a whole nation.

CARLOS TODI

5807 Ponce de Leon Blvd., Coral Gables, Fla.

Approved by the Board of Directors of the P.R. 75-00148-0000700510020-8